

REMARKS

The objection to the drawings under 37 CFR 1.83(a) is respectfully traversed. The various instances of “and/or” have been deleted, so that no change to the drawings is required.

The objection to the specification under 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1) is respectfully traversed. The various instances of “and/or” have been deleted.

The rejection of claims 2, 9, 16 and 19 under 35 USC 112 is respectfully traversed. The various instances of “like” have been deleted.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC 102

The rejection of claims 1, 3, 5 - 7 , 12 - 14, 17, 18, 23-24, 26, 28-29 under 35 USC 102 (b) is respectfully traversed as being moot in view of the amendments.

Applicants readily agree that the concept of activation is well known. The concept is broad, however, and Wollrath is dealing with an instance in which existing programs (objects, etc.) are turned off or on in response to the activation token (page 2, first paragraph) in order to conserve system resources, not for security.

Wollrath, in the right column of page 8 cited by the examiner, specifies that "These tokens must supply the following information: a unique identifier for the object, the address of the objects activator, the executable file name of the server program, - ", etc.

In other words, Wollrath's system is one in which: a) the properties of the various objects are known to the subsystem that transmits activation tokens; and b) the danger of revealing properties of the objects to a third party is not a concern.

This requirement distinguishes Wollrath's teaching from that required by the claims, in which security is the purpose of the activity, so that the provider transmits at least two sets of parameters to its customers without an indication being transmitted to tell the customer which data to use; (i.e. naming characteristics

does not include the identity of customer subsystems having a particular set of characteristics).

This feature has been inserted in the claims by requiring that the provider does not have data on the characteristics of individual customer systems.

In addition, claims 3 and 10 require that the tokens received include both relevant and non-relevant tokens, so that a hostile observer cannot identify groups of customer systems that have the same characteristics.

As discussed on page 5, the provider transmits data that is interpreted by the customer, so that an observer will not be able to deduce the system parameters of the customer.

Applicants maintain that this approach is contrary to that of Wollrath, in that it is relatively inefficient by forcing the individual customer systems to make a decision that could be more efficiently done at the central provider location,

This relative inefficiency results in a more secure system by eliminating a security weakness in the transmission system.

The rejection of claims 2, 4, 11, 19, 22 under 35 USC 103 is respectfully traversed for the same reasons as the rejection under 35 USC 102.

For the foregoing reasons, allowance of the claims is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Eric W. Petraske", is written over a horizontal line.

by: Eric W. Petraske, Attorney
Registration No. 28,459
Tel. (203) 798-1857